TO BE COMPLETED BY APPLICANT **EVALUATION FOR AGENCY USE ONLY**

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

Purpose of Checklist.

The State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA), chapter 43.21 RCW, requires all governmental agencies to consider the environmental impacts of a proposal before making decisions. An environmental impact statement (EIS) must be prepared for all proposals with probable significant adverse impacts on the quality of the environment. The purpose of this checklist is to provide information to help you and the agency identify impacts from your proposal (and to reduce or avoid impacts from the proposal, if it can be done) and to help the agency decide whether an EIS is required.

Instructions for Applicants.

This environmental checklist asks you to describe some basic information about your proposal. Governmental agencies use this checklist to determine whether the environmental impacts of your proposal are significant, requiring preparation of an EIS. Answer the questions briefly, with the most precise information known, or give the best description you can.

You must answer each question accurately and carefully, to the best of your knowledge. In most cases you should be able to answer the questions from your own observations or project plans without the need to hire experts. If you really do not know the answer, or if a question does not apply to your proposal write "do no know" or "does not apply." Complete answers to the questions now may avoid unnecessary delays later.

Some questions ask about governmental regulations, such as zoning, shoreline, and landmark designations. Answer these questions if you can. If you have problems, the governmental agencies can assist you.

The checklist questions apply to all parts of your proposal, even if you plan to do them over a period of time or on different parcels of land. Attach any additional information that will help describe your proposal or its environmental effects. The agency to which you submit this checklist may ask you to explain your answers or provide additional information reasonably related to determining if there may be significant adverse impact.

Use of Checklist for Nonproject Proposals.

Complete this checklist for nonproject proposals, even though questions may be answered "does not apply." IN ADDITION, complete the SUPPLEMENTAL SHEET FOR NONPROJECT ACTIONS (part D).

For nonproject actions, the references in the checklist to the words "project," "applicant," and "property or site" should be read as "proposal," "proposer," and "affected geographic area," respectively.

A. BACKGROUND

1. Name of proposed project, if applicable:

Citywide Skatepark Plan

2. Name of applicant:

Seattle Parks and Recreation

3. Address and phone number of applicant and contact person:

Susanne K. Friedman
Seattle Parks and Recreation

800 Maynard Ave South, 3rd Floor
Seattle, Washington 98134-1336
206.684.0902
susanne.friedman@seattle.gov

4. Date checklist prepared:

September 19, 2006

5. Agency requesting checklist:

Seattle Parks and Recreation

6. Proposed timing or schedule (including phasing, if applicable):

A briefing and public hearing will be made to the Parks Board of Commissioners on the proposed draft plan on December 14, 2007. Upon completion of SEPA process the Citywide Skatepark Plan will be submitted by the Superintendent of Parks to Seattle City Council for possible approval and adoption.

There is currently no funding for any of the individual project sites. The final proposed Plan will include recommendations on prioritization of projects suitable for possible future funding and development, which may be implemented incrementally through ongoing capital funding and leveraged match. Individual skatepark projects may warrant additional environmental review under SEPA.

Individual projects implemented under the Citywide Skatepark Plan will be subject to a public involvement process in accordance with the Department's Public Involvement Policy. Citizens, groups and organizations affected by the proposed projects would be included in the development of individual site plans.

7. Do you have any plans for future additions, expansion, or further activity related to or connected with this proposal? If yes, explain.

The Citywide Skatepark Plan is a long range, 20 year plus vision. As such, future park acquisitions and public private partnerships may provide opportunities for the addition of facilities at other park sites not envisioned at this time. Development of individual sites will depend on the availability of future funding, and in cases of reservoirs and other properties not owned by Parks, on working with the owner and community groups on the creation of a plan for each site.

8. List any environmental information you know about that has been prepared, or will be prepared, directly related to this proposal.

There are no project sites located in identified environmentally critical areas, designated natural areas or greenbelts. However, a variety of environmental information is available for the Puget Sound region and specifically, Seattle Parks. As any specific skatepark project moves forward, any and all available environmental documents will be consulted to ascertain the potential for significant adverse environmental impacts.

9. Do you know whether applications are pending for governmental approvals of other proposals directly affecting the property covered by your proposal? If yes, explain.

No applications are known to be pending for governmental approvals of other proposals directly affecting

the properties covered by this programmatic checklist.

There may be other City of Seattle departments (such as Seattle Public Utilities) with proposed work in the vicinity of proposed skatepark sites. Parks will work with other agencies and organizations to minimize potential cumulative impacts from work that may be proposed for the same time schedule.

10. List any government approvals or permits that will be needed for your proposal, if known.

No permits are required at this time. Individual projects implemented under the Citywide Skatepark Plan would be subject to design development and permit review in accordance with the Department's requirements, and may be subject to other local, state and/or federal permits and the permit requirements.

11. Give brief, complete description of your proposal, including the proposed uses and the site of the project and site. There are several questions later in this checklist that ask you to describe certain aspects of your proposal. You do not need to repeat those answers on this page. (Lead agencies may modify this form to include additional specific information on project description.)

The Citywide Skatepark Plan's purpose is to develop a comprehensive skatepark system plan for Seattle that encompasses recommendations on future locations for these facilities throughout the city.

Proposed Skatepark Typology -

1. **Skatedots** – (20 sq ft – 1,500 sq ft) Small skateable elements along paths, as part of streetscapes or in parks.

2. **Skatespots** – (1,500 – 10,000 sq ft) Similar in size to a single tennis court. These facilities could accommodate a narrow range of skill abilities and terrain due to their size, with up to 13 users at one time.

3. **District Skateparks** – (10,000 – 30,000 sq ft) About the size of two tennis courts. These facilities could accommodate a wide range of skill abilities and 10 – 30 users at one time depending on configuration.

4. **Regional Skatepark** – (greater than 30,000 sq ft) Similar in size to a Little League baseball or football field. This facility could accommodate 50 - 300 users at a time. Sufficient in size for competitions, concessions and other revenue generating options.

12. Location of the proposal. Give sufficient information for a person to understand the precise location of your proposed project, including a street address, if any, and section, township, and range, if known. If a proposal would occur over a range of area, provide the range or boundaries of the site(s). Provide a legal description, site plan, vicinity map, and topographic map, if reasonably available. While you should submit any plans required by the agency, you are not required to duplicate maps or detailed plans submitted with any permit applications related to this checklist.

Thirty preliminary site locations throughout Seattle are included under this programmatic checklist, with the potential for additional sites to be added in the future (Map of locations under consideration attached). The Framework of Assumptions, Siting Criteria and additional site analysis will be further developed and detailed as the Citywide Skatepark Plan is reviewed and ultimately adopted by Seattle's City Council.

Planning or construction for the following skateparks on Parks property was under way before the Citywide planning process began and are not included under this document: Ballard Commons Park, 5701 22nd Ave.

NW; Lower Woodland Park, near 5200 block of Green Lake Way N; Dahl Playfield, 7700 25th Ave. NE; and Jefferson Park, 4165 16th Ave. S. Note that many of these already planned future facilities have been subject to individual, projects specific environmental review consistent with local and state SEPA requirements.

Locations include:

Sector	***Proposed Location***	***Type of Facility***	***Address***
Northwest Sector			
1	Interurban Trail	Skatedot	N 138th St & Linden Ave N
2	Sandel Playground	Skatedot	9053 1st Ave NW
3*	Gasworks Park	Skatedot	2101 N Northlake Way
Northeast Sector			
4	Lake City Playground	Skatespot	26th Ave NE & NE 123rd St
5	Cowen Park	Skatespot	5849 15th Ave NE
6	Maple Leaf Reservoir	District	Roosevelt Way NE and NE 85th St
7	Northgate Park-n-Ride	District	NE 112th between 3rd and 5th Ave NE
8	Roosevelt Reservoir	District	15th Ave NE and NE 73rd
9	Magnuson Park	Regional	7400 Sand Point Way NE
Central West Sector			
10	Magnolia Playfield	Skatedot	2518 34th Ave W
11	Myrtle Edwards Park	Skatedot	3130 Alaskan Way W
Central East Sector			
12	Eastlake and Allison	Skatedot	Eastlake Ave E and E Allison St
13	Garfield-Medgar Evers Pool	Skatedot	2323 E Cherry St
14	Judkins Park & Sam Smith Over Look	Skatespot	2150 S. Norman, 23rd Ave S & S. Atlantic St.
15	Pratt Park	Skatespot	1800 S. Main
16	Miller Playfield	Skatespot	400 19th Ave E
Southwest Sector			
17	Alki Beach	Skatedot	area near Alki Bathhouse: 2701 Alki Ave SW
18	Denny Middle School Athletic Complex	Skatespot	South of SW Community Center: 2801 SW Thistle St.
19	Hiawatha Playfield	Skatespot	2700 California Ave SW
20	Delridge Playfield	Skatespot	4458 Delridge Way Sw
21	Fairmount Playfield	Skatespot	5400 Fauntleroy Way S
22	Roxhill Park	Skatespot	2850 SW Roxbury
23	High Point Playfield	District	6920 34th Ave SW
24	Myrtle Reservoir	District	35th Ave SW and SW Myrtle St
25	West Seattle Stadium	District	4432 35th Ave SW
26	Westcrest Park	District	9000 8th Ave SW
Southeast Sector			
27	John C. Little Park	Skatespot	6961 37th Ave S
28	Brighton Playfield	District	6000 39th Ave S.
29	Rainier Beach Playfield	District	8802 Rainier Ave S
30	Rainier Playfield/ Genesee Playfield	District	3700 S. Alaska St.

TO BE COMPLETED BY APPLICANT **EVALUATION FOR AGENCY USE ONLY**

B. ENVIRONMENTAL ELEMENTS

Note: This is a non-project, area-wide programmatic action in the City of Seattle. The Citywide Skatepark Plan provides recommendations for 30 proposed sites, with the option for additional sites to be added in the future. In addition, each site included in the Citywide Plan, would have its own individual project evaluation completed prior to construction.

1. Earth

a. General description of the site (circle one): Flat, rolling, hilly, steep slopes, mountainous, other:

b. What is the steepest slope on the site (approximate percent slope)?

The sites themselves are generally flat to gently sloping, with generally less than 2% slopes. Seattle parks however, contain a variety of terrain.

c. What general types of soils are found on the site (for example, clay, sand, gravel, peat, muck)? If you know the classification of agricultural soils, specify them and note any prime farmland.

* Rows shaded in gray represent gray-to-gray sites. In this instance, the term 'gray-to-gray' represents proposed sites that are currently covered with either asphalt, concrete or a gravel base, e.g. an existing roadway or parking lot, and represent no net loss of green space or increase in impervious surfacing. Soil information taken from United States Geologic Survey, City of Seattle, Pacific Northwest Center for Geologic mapping studies, University of Washington, Open File Report 2005-1252

Sector	***Proposed Location***	***Soil Type***
Northwest Sector		
1	Interurban Trail	Qvi & Qvt – Vashon ice - contact deposits & Vashon glacial till
2	Sandel Playground	Qvt – Vashon glacial till
3*	Gasworks Park	Qvt – Vashon glacial till – Artificial fill
Northeast Sector		
4	Lake City Playground	Qvr – Vashon recessional outwash deposits
5	Cowen Park	Qva – Vashon advanced outwash deposits
6	Maple Leaf Reservoir	Qvt – Vashon glacial till – Artificial fill
7	Northgate Park-n-Ride	Qp – Peat – Modified land
8	Roosevelt Reservoir	Qva – Vashon advanced outwash deposits – Artificial fill
9	Magnuson Park	Qal – Modified land
Central West Sector		
10	Magnolia Playfield	Qva – Vashon advanced outwash deposits
11	Myrtle Edwards Park	Qtf – Tideflat deposits – Artificial fill
Central East Sector		
12	Eastlake and Allison	Qpo – Pre-Olympia deposits
13	Garfield-Medgar Evers Pool	NA
14	Judkins Park & Sam Smith Over Look	Qvr – Vashon recessional outwash deposits – Landfill debris
15	Pratt Park	Qvt – Vashon glacial till
16	Miller Playfield	Qvt – Vashon glacial till

Southwest Sector		
17	Alki Beach	Qbu – Uplifted beach deposits
18	Denny Middle School Athletic Complex	Qvt - Vashon glacial till
19	Hiawatha Playfield	Qva – Vashon advanced outwash deposits
20	Delridge Playfield	Qvr – Vashon recessional outwash deposits – Regraded Land
21	Fairmount Playfield	Qvt – Vashon glacial till
22	Roxhill Park	Qvt & Qvr – Vashon glacial till & Vashon recessional outwash deposits – Artificial Fill
23	High Point Playfield	Qvt – Vashon glacial till
24	Myrtle Reservoir	Qvt – Vashon glacial till – Modified land
25	West Seattle Stadium	Qvi – Vashon ice-contact deposits
26	Westcrest Park	Qvt – Vashon glacial till
Southeast Sector		
27	John C. Little Park	Tb – Blakely formation
28	Brighton Playfield	Tb & Qvr – Blakely formation & Vashon recessional outwash deposits – graded land
29	Rainier Beach Playfield	Qvt – Vashon glacial till
30	Rainier Playfield/ Genesee Playfield	Qvrl – Vashon recessional lacustrine deposits – landfill debris

d. Are there surface indications or history of unstable soils in the immediate vicinity? If so, describe.

West Seattle Stadium has a man-made slope east of the proposed site location for this area which may contain unstable soils.
Myrtle Edwards Park is located in a liquefaction-prone area.
Portions of Genesee Playfield and Judkins Park are built on top of old landfill sites.

e. Describe the purpose, type, and approximate quantities of any filling or grading proposed. Indicate source of fill.

Facility	**Approximate Quantity of Grading needed**	**Approximate Quantity of Fill needed**	**Type of fill**
Skatedot	1-5 cubic yards	2-10 cubic yards	Compactable, low density fill
Skatespot	5-250 cubic yards	25-250 cubic yards	Compactable, low density fill
District	185-1000 cubic yards	185-750 cubic yards	Compactable, low density fill
Regional	555+ cubic yards	750+ cubic yards	Compactable, low density fill

In order to place skatepark bowls inset or below grade in the ground, some excavation may be necessary depending on individual design nuances at each site. To support below-grade concrete substructures some aggregate fill may be installed such as clean sand, rock, controlled-density fill (CDF), lean-mix concrete (LMC) and well-graded mixtures of sand and gravel, commonly known as *gravel borrow* or *pit run*, typically used to provide a structural subgrade. All fill materials imported to the sites would be free of organic debris and potential chemical or biological contaminates or hazards, and obtained from a tested and approved source.

f. Could erosion occur as a result of clearing, construction, or use? If so, generally describe.

Soil erosion associated with a storm water event is always a possibility. However, erosion is unlikely to occur as the areas for construction are flat.

g. About what percent of the site will be covered with impervious surfaces after project construction (for example, asphalt or buildings)?

Impervious surfaces are anticipated to cover 100% - 85% of the skateboard facilities depending on individual design nuances. Adoption of the Citywide Skatepark Plan is a programmatic action. At the project level, site specific elements such as the ratio of impervious to pervious surface would be calculated as a component of the project specific environmental review. While 100% of any skatepark facility woiuld be comprised of impervious material, the remaining park area would still be pervious, exclusive of pathways, parking or structures.

The following list of proposed sites are currently covered with impervious surfaces:
Gasworks Park
Maple Leaf Reservoir
Northgate Park-N-Ride
Roosevelt Reservoir
Manguson Park
Eastlake and Allison
Garfield-Medgar Evers Pool
Alki Beach
Myrtle Reservoir
Westcrest Park (reservoir site)

h. Proposed measures to reduce or control erosion, or other impacts to the earth, if any:

A Temporary Erosion & Sedimentation Control Plan (TESCP) would be employed as part of Parks' Best Management Practices during construction. This would include but may not be limited to covering exposed soils to eliminate silt-laden storm flow.

2. Air

a. What type of emissions to the air would result from the proposal (i.e., dust, automobile, odors, industrial wood smoke) during construction and when the project is completed? If any, generally describe and give approximate quantities if known.

There could be short-term emissions of engine exhaust from vehicles and machinery associated with any construction activity. These impacts are expected to be minor in scale and localized in extent. No long-term air emissions will result from the completed projects.

b. Are there any off-site sources of emissions or odor that may affect your proposal? If so, generally describe.

None known

c. Proposed measures to reduce or control emissions or other impacts to air, if any:

Use of properly tuned machinery, wetting of any exposed soils, and similar measures will reduce or avoid engine exhaust and dust problems that could occur during construction activities. No long term emission or odor impacts are expected.

3. Water

a. Surface:

1) Is there any surface water body on or in the immediate vicinity of the site (including year-round and seasonal streams, saltwater, lakes, ponds, wetlands)? If yes, describe type and provide names. If appropriate, state what stream or river it flows into.

This is a citywide plan, and as such encompasses the entire City of Seattle. There are many surface water bodies within the City of Seattle. Water bodies in the vicinity of the Parks identified in the Citywide Skatepark Plan include: Puget Sound, Elliott Bay, Duwamish Waterway, Salmon Bay, Shilshole Bay, Lake Union, Portage Bay, Lake Washington, Bitter Lake, Thornton Creek watershed, Longfellow Creek, Ravenna Creek, Roxhill (man-made wetland) and others.

2) Will the project require any work over, in, or adjacent to (within 200 feet) the described waters? If yes, please describe and attach available plans.

Adoption of the Citywide Skatepark Plan is a programmatic action. At the project level, site specific elements such as the location of specific facilities adjacent to water bodies will be identified as a component of the project specific environmental review. Eastlake & Allison, Gasworks Park, Myrtle Edwards Park, Alki Beach and Roxhill Park could potentially have skate elements close to 200' to their respective adjacent water bodies.

3) Estimate the amount of fill and dredge material that would be placed in or removed from surface water or wetlands and indicate the area of the site that would be affected. Indicate the source of fill material.

None

4) Will the proposal require surface water withdrawals or diversions? Give general description, purpose, and approximate quantities if known.

No

5) Does the proposal lie within a lOO-year floodplain? If so, note location on the site plan.

Portions of the City are within the 100-year flood plains, but none of the proposed Park sites are within identified flood hazard zones.

6) Does the proposal involve any discharges of waste materials to surface waters? If so, describe the type of waste and anticipated volume of discharge.

No

b. Ground:

1) Will ground water be withdrawn or will water be discharged to ground water? Give general description, purpose, and approximate quantities if known.

Stormwater infiltration goes to groundwater. Specific sites may use infiltration as a method to control and discharge runoff. Other sites will connect to existing storm drainage systems.

2) Describe waste material that will be discharged into the ground from septic tanks or other sources, if any (for example: domestic sewage; industrial, containing the following chemicals ...; agricultural; etc.). Describe the general size of the system, the number of such systems, the number of houses to be served (if applicable), or the number of animals or humans the system(s) are expected to serve.

No waste material will be discharged from skatepark facilities into the ground.

c. Water Runoff (including storm water):

1) Describe the source of runoff (including storm water) and method of collection and disposal, if any (include quantities, if known). Where will this water flow? Will this water flow into other waters? If so, describe.

Storm water would be collected via sheet drain or catch basin to storm drainage or infiltration trenches. No additional storm surface or subsurface movement is anticipated.

2) Could waste materials enter ground or surface waters? If so, generally describe.

It is unlikely that waste materials would enter ground or surface waters without being removed via oil/water separators, surface soils or settling out before reaching major water bodies. Runoff from skate facilities is considered 'clean' runoff.

d. Proposed measures to reduce or control surface, ground, or runoff water impacts, if any:

At the project level, City of Seattle Best Management Practices would be utilized to control runoff as appropriate. During excavation and other related construction work, silt barriers would be installed to prevent silt flows into the storm water system.

4. Plants

a. Check or circle types of vegetation found on the site:

deciduous trees: alder, maple, sycamore
evergreen: fir, cedar, spruce, pine

Many areas in the City of Seattle provide habitat for a variety of aquatic and terrestrial plants typically found in urban areas. Plant communities include deciduous forest, isolated patches of coniferous forest, shrub and grasslands. Adoption of the Citywide Skatepark Plan is a programmatic action. At the project level, site specific elements such as vegetation will be noted as a component of the project specific environmental review.

b. What kind and amount of vegetation will be removed or altered?

A majority of the sites would require removal of grass or field turf for the construction of skate facilities. Some sites might require the removal or relocation of select trees depending on the project site plans.

c. List threatened or endangered species known to be on or near the site.

Seattle Parks are home to a variety of state and federally listed species. A thorough site survey and evaluation of approved data bases will be undertaken for each project site, once chosen.

d. Proposed landscaping, use of native plants, or other measures to preserve or enhance vegetation on the site, if any:

At the project level, site specific landscaping will be developed and noted as a component of the project specific environmental review. Existing vegetation, exclusive of grass, will be preserved, relocated and/or incorporated into any project design to the extent practical.

5. Animals

a. Circle any birds and animals that have been observed on or near the site or are known to be on or near the site:

birds; hawk, heron, eagle, songbirds, geese, seagulls, crows
mammals; small mammals, rodents
invertebrates;
fish;
amphibian;
reptiles;

b. List any threatened or endangered species known to be on or near the site.

The Seattle Parks are home to a variety of state and federally protected species. Specific sites have been chosen to have the least possible impact to wildlife. At the project level, the Washington State Fish & Wildlife database will be consulted to determine the potential for impacts to protected wildlife, if any, and appropriate mitigation determined in cooperation with Fish & Wildlife.

As of August, 2006, the bald eagle remains listed as a state and federally threatened species under the Endangered Species Act. Nesting areas are found in many of Seattle's parks, waterways and some residential neighborhoods. The Puget Sound chinook salmon, was listed as threatened under the Endangered Species Act on May 24, 1999, and occurs near park areas adjacent to Elliott Bay.

Bull trout, listed as threatened under the Endangered Species Act on November 1, 1999, could occur in its anadromous form near park areas adjacent to Elliott Bay; however, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) does not monitor the bull trout in the Green/Duwamish system because, according to its records, bull trout do not spawn in this system.

The Cedar River - Lake Washington Watershed is the land area in which rainwater drains to Lake Washington and out through the Hiram Chittenden Locks. The Cedar River - Lake Washington watershed includes the Cedar River and its tributaries, May Creek, Coal Creek, Mercer Island, Mercer Slough, Kelsey Creek, Juanita Creek, Forbes Creek, Lyon Creek, McAleer Creek, Thornton Creek, and Ravenna Creek. This watershed supports a diversity of salmon, including chinook, coho, sockeye and steelhead.

c. Is the site part of a migration route? If so, explain.

Washington State is part of the Pacific Flyway, with many Seattle parks and reservoirs being used as a stopover for a variety of migratory waterfowl.

d. Proposed measures to preserve or enhance wildlife, if any:

The Washington State Fish & Wildlife database will be consulted to determine the presence of any listed species and appropriate measures taken as determined in cooperation with Fish & Wildlife.

6. Energy and Natural Resources

a. What kinds of energy (electric, natural gas, oil, wood stove, solar) will be used to meet the completed project's energy needs? Describe whether it will be used for heating, manufacturing, etc.

Area lighting may be considered during the project phases for select district or regional facilities.

b. Would your project affect the potential use of solar energy by adjacent properties? If so, generally describe.

No.

c. What kinds of energy conservation features are included in the plans of this proposal? List other proposed measures to reduce or control energy impacts, if any:

Programmed lighting controls would be installed for any future area illumination.

7. Environmental Health

a. Are there any environmental health hazards including exposure to toxic chemicals, risk of fire and explosion, spill, or hazardous waste, that could occur as a result of this proposal? If so, describe.

No.

1) Describe special emergency services that might be required.

Site features designed for skateboarding would include the same emergency service vehicle access provided for other existing sports fields and athletic facilities.

2) Proposed measures to reduce or control environmental health hazards, if any:

Any structural finishes would minimize use of materials that release volatile organic compounds (VOCs).

b. Noise

1) What types of noise exist in the area which may affect your project (for example: traffic, equipment operation, other)?

Typical urban noises already exist in the vicinity of the sites. Urban residential arterial roads have a predicted noise level averaging at least 65 dBA during daytime and early evening use, the same period of operation for a skatepark.[1] Neighborhood playgrounds and parks are also predicted to have acceptable noise levels over 70 dBL during the daytime.[2]

2) What types and levels of noise would be created by or associated with the project on a short-term or a long-term basis (for example: traffic, construction, operation, other)? Indicate what hours noise would come from site?

Operation of some construction equipment is anticipated for short periods of time during construction. Construction would take place during daylight hours, and noise would be limited thereto. The projects would be required to comply fully with the Seattle Noise Ordinance. There could be minor, temporary,

[1] Seattle DPD web site www.ci.seattle.wa.us/dpd/enforcement/noise-abatement
Also see *Hot Mix Asphalt*, Decibel level chart for highways, roads and streets, National Asphalt Pavement Association, 1999
[2] Riverside CA General Plan – Noise Existing Conditions Report, Figure 1 Maximum Nose Levels for Various Uses

noise increases of a localized nature due to construction activities on-site. No off-site impacts are expected.

Long-term noise impacts are as follows: Portland Oregon prepared a chart of predicted noise levels for skate parks in Figure 1 below.[3]

Figure 1

Location	Tail and Nose related sounds	Skateboard Truck related sounds	Approximate Distance from edge of Park to location
Reference measurements	*65-71 dBA*	*54-63 dBA*	*50 Feet from skateboard*
Outside predicted sound levels at the closest home from the location referred to as SITE A	45-51 dBA	34-43 dBA	550 Feet
Inside predicted sound levels at the closest home from the location referred to as SITE A	35-41 dBA	24-33 dBA	550 Feet
Outside predicted sound levels at the closest home from the location referred to as SITE B.	56-62 dBA	45-54 dBA	160 Feet
Inside predicted sound levels at the closest home from the location referred to as SITE B.	46-52 dBA	35-44 dBA	160 Feet

Noise levels recorded by Seattle Parks and Recreation for comparison at an existing skatepark facility are listed below.

Figure 2
Comparative Noise Level Readings

Seattle Center Skatepark [2 pm Feb 22, 2006]

[skatepark 10' from skaters, at the furthest point in the park from Broad Street and at the main stop/start point on the course]

activity	dB meter reading
boarders rolling by	62-63
landing on their boards	66-68
very hard board landing	70
no skating	55-58

Seattle Center Skatepark [2 pm Feb 22, 2006]

[Sidewalk between Broad St and skatepark, with meter aimed at the street]

activity	dB meter reading
car traffic	65-70
buses	75
speeding taxi	67
no traffic	55-58

Change in noise of 10 dBA is typically perceived as a doubling of noise, whereas a change of less than 3 dBA is not normally perceptible to human hearing. Skateboard noise levels from metal frames and wooden tail and nose sounds are predicted to generate noise up to 62 dBA in front of residences approximately 160 feet away, over very short intervals. This is similar to the sound and noise level of a batted baseball.[4]

3) Proposed measures to reduce or control noise impacts, if any:

During construction, use of properly muffled machinery will reduce noise impacts that otherwise could happen during construction. All construction will occur on weekdays to avoid undue effects upon park visitation, which typically is higher in the evening and on weekends. Noise will also be regulated by the Seattle Noise Ordinance, SMC 25.08, which specifies hours allowed for construction related noise.

[3] Memo from Paul Van Orden, Noise Control Officer, Planning and Development Review, City of Portland, February 2, 2006
[4] Ibid

8. Land and Shoreline Use

a. What is the current use of the site and adjacent properties?

The majority of the sites are all located in existing Park properties and are not actively programmed, nor have a designated use. Adjacent properties vary according to each park site from residential, industrial, commercial, and shoreline. Because parks are meant to be enjoyed by the public, many are located in close proximity to residential areas.

Adjacent properties include:
Park properties – ball fields, play areas, community centers and open space,
Seattle School District properties,
Seattle Public Utilities properties,
Seattle Department of Transportation properties and right of way.,
Washington Department of Transportation right of way.
Seattle Housing Authority properties,
Single and Multi family residential properties,
Commercial properties.

Northgate Park-N-Ride is currently a parking lot for King County Metro Transit, but slated as a future Park acquisition. Property to the south of the site is commercial with a parking garage, west, north and east is multifamily housing. Maple Leaf, Roosevelt, Myrtle and Westcrest sites contain reservoirs owned by Seattle Public Utilities and are slated for lidding and as future park sites. These sites are surrounded by a combination of single family, multi family, commercial and park properties.

Eastlake & Allison is in WSDOT and SDOT R.O.W. and is located underneath Interstate-5. The site is currently paved and landscaped, and used as turn around spot for trucks. The site is surrounded on two sides by major arterials, and multifamily housing on the south.

b. Has the site been used for agriculture? If so, describe.

None of the sites are known to have been used for agriculture in recent times.

c. Describe any structures on the site.

Building structures found at many of the park properties include: comfort station buildings, kiosks, shelter houses and community centers. Other structures are furniture and public amenities including picnic shelters, tables, benches, fountains, play areas, ballfields with dugouts and fencing.

The proposed skatepark at Warren G. Magnuson Park currently has a hangar facility on site. Other portions of the park contain additional hangars, numerous buildings with a variety of uses and parking lots.

Reservoir sites – Myrtle Reservoir, Westcrest Park, Maple Leaf and Roosevelt Reservoirs, would be fitted with concrete lids and park facilities developed on the lid surface.

d. Will any structures be demolished? If so, what?

The hangar at Warren G. Magnuson park would either be moth-balled until a future date, potentially demolished or used for a new use, such as a skatepark facility.

e. What is the current zoning classification of the site?

The majority of Park sites are zoned for single-family residential use. However, a park is a use which is allowed in all zones.

Sector	***Proposed Location***	***Type of Facility***	***Zoning***
Northwest Sector			
1	Interurban Trail	Skatedot	SF 7200
2	Sandel Playground	Skatedot	SF 5000
3	Gasworks Park	Skatedot	IB U/45
Northeast Sector			
4	Lake City Playground	Skatespot	SF 5000
5	Cowen Park	Skatespot	L-4
6	Maple Leaf Reservoir	District	SF 5000
7	Northgate Park-n-Ride	District	L-4
8	Roosevelt Reservoir	District	SF 5000
9	Magnuson Park	Regional	SF 7200
Central West Sector			
10	Magnolia Playfield	Skatedot	SF 5000
11	Myrtle Edwards Park	Skatedot	Variety of Downtown and Industrial zones, including: IC-45 & DH 1/45
Central East Sector			
12	Eastlake and Allison	Skatedot	NC3-40
13	Garfield-Medgar Evers Pool	Skatedot	SF 5000
14	Judkins Park & Sam Smith Over Look	Skatespot	L-2 & LDT
15	Pratt Park	Skatespot	L-3
16	Miller Playfield	Skatespot	SF 5000
Southwest Sector			
17	Alki Beach	Skatedot	NC1-30
18	Denny Middle School Athletic Complex	Skatespot	SF 7200
19	Hiawatha Playfield	Skatespot	SF 5000
20	Delridge Playfield	Skatespot	SF 5000
21	Fairmount Playfield	Skatespot	SF 5000 & L-2
22	Roxhill Park	Skatespot	SF 7200
23	High Point Playfield	District	L-1
24	Myrtle Reservoir	District	SF 5000
25	West Seattle Stadium	District	SF 5000
26	Westcrest Park	District	SF 7200
Southeast Sector			
27	John C. Little Park	Skatespot	L-3
28	Brighton Playfield	District	SF 5000
29	Rainier Beach Playfield	District	SF 5000 & NC2-30
30	Rainier Playfield/ Genesee Playfield	District	SF 5000

f. What is the current comprehensive plan designation of the site?

Park sites are designated as Public Open Space in Seattle's Comprehensive Plan.

g. If applicable, what is the current shoreline master program designation of the site?

Alki Beach (CR), Myrtle Edwards Park (CM-DF & UH-DF) and Gasworks Park (CM) are located within one or more shoreline environments.

h. Has any part of the site been classified as an "environmentally sensitive" area? If so, specify.

Seattle's Park system encompasses properties in a myriad of environmentally sensitive areas. Skatepark facilities will not be built in the following environmentally critical areas: designated wetlands, riparian corridors, wildlife habitats, flood prone areas, steep slopes, potential or known slide areas.

Genesee Playfield and portions of Judkins Park were built over old landfill areas. The challenges to building a skateboard facility in these sites is an engineering one. If these sites are chosen, any construction activities will be consistent with the requirements of the City's ECA ordinance. Myrtle Edwards Park is within a liquefaction prone area – any construction activities will be consistent with appropriate ECA regulations.

i. Approximately how many people would reside or work in the completed project?

A Regional facility may be staffed by 1-5 Parks personnel.

j. Approximately how many people would the completed project displace?

None

k. Proposed measures to avoid or reduce displacement impacts, if any.

N/A

l. Proposed measures to ensure the proposal is compatible with existing and project land uses and plans, if any.

Skateboard park use is consistent with existing active recreational uses.

9. Housing

a. Approximately how many units would be provided, if any? Indicate whether high, middle, or low-income housing?

None

b. Approximately how many units, if any, would be eliminated? Indicate whether high, middle, or low-income housing?

None

c. Proposed measures to reduce or control housing impacts, if any.

None

10. Aesthetics

a. What is the tallest height of any proposed structure(s), not including antennas; what is the principal exterior building material(s) proposed?

Adoption of the Citywide Skatepark Plan is a programmatic action. At the project level, site specific designs will be developed for each facility. The majority of skatepark features tend to lie at, or below, grade. The tallest structures would be found at the District or Regional level facilities and portions could be up to twelve feet above grade and made of reinforced concrete.

b. What views in the immediate vicinity would be altered or obstructed?

None

c. Proposed measures to reduce or control aesthetic impacts, if any.

Adoption of the Citywide Skatepark Plan is a programmatic action. At the project level, site specific designs will be developed for each facility including aesthetic integration of the design and facility into the site to minimize any impacts.

11. Light and Glare

a. What type of light or glare will the proposal produce? What time of day would it mainly occur?

At the project level, lighting may be considered for District and Regional level facilities. Lighting would be used within the current park operating times and would include designs to minimize any potential glare or spillover.

b. Could light or glare from the finished project be a safety hazard or interfere with views?

No

c. What existing off-site sources of light or glare may affect your proposal?

None

d. Proposed measures to reduce or control light and glare impacts, if any:

At the project level, any lighting designs would include shielded fixtures and other design features to restrict light glare and spillover past the property line to the east.

12. Recreation

a. What designated and informal recreational opportunities are in the immediate vicinity?

According to the City of Seattle Comprehensive Plan (1994) and Seattle's Parks and Recreation Plan (2000), numerous recreational opportunities and facilities exist within the City of Seattle. The City of Seattle Parks and Recreation Department administers over 400 parks, recreational resources and open areas within the City of Seattle. The system is diverse and woven into the fabric of Seattle's neighborhoods and contributes significantly to the City's identity, stability, urban design, and network of public services.

Seattle's park and recreation system is comprised of open space, parks, boulevards and trails, beaches, and lakes and creeks; recreational, cultural, environmental, and educational facilities; a broad variety of programs; and people. Park facilities include: community centers, tennis courts, picnic shelters, wading pools, comfort stations, soccer fields, baseball and softball fields, green space, golf courses, regional parks, fishing piers, playgrounds and swimming beaches.

b. Would the proposed project displace any existing recreational uses? If so, describe.

No actively programmed existing recreational uses are displaced, however, some of the sites proposed in the Citywide Skatepark Plan would displace passive open space areas.

c. Proposed measures to reduce or control impacts on recreation, including recreation opportunities to be provided by the project or applicant, if any:

There are approximately 20,000 skateboarders in the City of Seattle[5]. Currently Seattle Parks owns and operates one public facility, located at Ballard Commons Park. The Citywide Skatepark Plan's purpose is to provide sites for future public skateparks. To reduce the impacts to passive open space, emphasis has been given to sites that are currently paved.

13. Historic and Cultural Preservation

a. Are there any places or objects listed on, or proposed for, national, state, or local preservation registers known to be on or next to the site? If so, generally describe.

Gasworks Park – Historic Landmark pending
Hiawatha Playfield – Landmarked site, Olmsted designed
Cowen Park – Olmsted influenced design, Cowen Park Bridge on the National Register of Historic Places
Warren G. Magnuson Park – Identified as a potential Historic District for listing to the National Register of Historic Places.

Gasworks Park - This 20 acre point on Lake Union was cleared in 1906 to construct a plant to manufacture gas from coal - later converted to crude oil. Import of natural gas in the 1950's made the plant obsolete. The city acquired the site for a park in 1962. The park was opened to the public in 1975. The boiler house has been converted to a Picnic Shelter with tables, fire grills and an open area. The former exhauster-compressor building, now a children's play barn, features a maze of brightly painted machinery.

Hiawatha Playfield – "A new era in public recreation in Seattle and in the Pacific Northwest was opened with the dedication of the recreation center on Hiawatha Playfield" in 1911. The Olmsted Brother's prepared the original design in 1911 for what was then the largest public playfield in Seattle. The Olmsted plan was drastically altered in 1932 when the demand for a longer running track caused its relocation from the east side of the center to the west and a continual redesign of the eastern half of the playfield.

Originally identified as the "West Seattle Playfield" in the newly annexed West Seattle (1907), it was named in time for the dedication, upon proposal of Park Commissioner Fredinand Schmitz, to honor the hero of a poem by Longfellow: Hiawatha. The 16th Century Mohawk Chieftan, was famed for his miraculous powers and deeds, brought about the Five National Confederation of Indians known as the League of Iroquois. Hiawatha lived nd roamed through the forests of Northern Michigan.

The ballfield was floodlighted in 1954. Lighting was replaced in 1967. The tennis courts are lighted. There is also a wading pool and a playarea. The ballfield has a sand-silt surface

Cowen Park – Olmsted influenced design. The Olmsted Brothers plans included numerous playgrounds and playfields, a manifestation of the new concept of public recreation which had been introduced with success in the East. These sites included buildings devoted to recreation (field houses) and facilities like

[5] Numbers taken from U.S. Pop 295,734,134 (2005 Census) and U.S. Skateboard participants 10.6 m estimated by SGMA International "Sports Participation in America" 2005 Edition.

ball fields, tennis courts, and playground apparatus which had unique maintenance requirements relative to park facilities.

Warren G. Magnuson Park - Magnuson Park was originally created from the former Sand Point Naval Air Station.

When the U.S. Navy transferred the properties to the City and University of Washington they were required under the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 to consider the effects of property transfer on historic resources, and identify means to avoid, reduce or mitigate them. This review established a Programmatic Agreement between the U.S. Navy, the Washington State Office of Archaeology and Historic Preservation, and the National Advisory Council on Historic Preservation.

A historic preservation covenant exists in the deed granting property to both the City of Seattle and the University of Washington. The covenant mandates that the Sand Point Historic Preservation Coordinator, on behalf of the State Historic Preservation Officer, will review proposals prior to any construction, alteration, remodeling, or demolition that would affect the integrity or appearance of historic resources within the District. The Sand Point Historic Properties Reuse and Protection Plan was developed in 1998 and is the main document guiding historic preservation within the District.

The Sand Point Historic District comprises approximately 73 acres and includes properties owned by Seattle Parks and Recreation, the University of Washington, and the Sand Point Community Housing Association. Twenty buildings and 23 landscape features are identified as contributing to the character of the district. Eleven buildings are identified as not contributing.

b. Generally describe any landmarks or evidence of historic, archaeological, scientific, or cultural importance known to be on or next to the site.

See above.

14. Transportation

a. Identify public streets and highways serving the site, and describe the proposed access to the existing street system. Show on site plans, if any.

Major public streets and highways, including State Route 99 and Interstate 5 serve the City. Numerous arterial, collector, and residential streets serve the City. The street address for each of the 30 park locations is included in response to question A.12. of this checklist.

b. Is site currently served by public transit? If not, what is the approximate distance to the nearest transit stop?

Every site in the Citywide Skatepark Plan is served by public transit with two blocks. Transit service within the City currently is provided by King County Metro, which operates an extensive network of local and express bus routes that provide frequent service. Transit service into and out of the area is provided by several agencies:

- Metro provides service to/from the parts of King County outside the City of Seattle (South King County, the Eastside, Shoreline, and Northshore);
- Sound Transit Regional Express provides express bus service to/from Pierce County, South King County, the Eastside, Shoreline/Northshore, and Snohomish County;
- Community Transit provides express bus service between Snohomish County and Downtown Seattle and the University District; and
- Sound Transit Sounder Commuter Rail provides peak period/peak direction rail service to/from Pierce County and South King County.

The express bus and commuter rail systems provide services that are focused mainly on Downtown Seattle. In addition to land-based transit systems, the Washington State Ferry System (WSF) provides transit connections to Bainbridge Island, Bremerton, and Vashon Island from Downtown Seattle, and to Vashon Island and South Kitsap County from West Seattle (Fauntleroy).

In addition to existing transit services in the area, major transit system expansions are under construction. Sound Transit currently is designing a Light Rail Transit (LRT) system that would provide a high-speed, high-capacity rail rapid transit connection between Northgate and SeaTac, via the University District, Downtown Seattle, and the Rainier Valley. Sound Transit also is planning to extend its Pierce County-Seattle Sounder commuter rail service north to Everett via the Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railroad (BNSF) mainline tracks.

c. How many parking spaces would the completed project have? How many would the project eliminate?

Parking may be considered at the District or Regional facility level. Warren G. Magnuson Park currently has a plethora of parking available. If a Regional skatepark facility is sited there, an assessment of parking needs and requirements would be evaluated during the project level environmental analysis.

The Northgate Park-N-Ride lot is currently owned and operated by Metro King County Tranist. The property will transfer to Parks after King County has completed their Transit Center modifications south of Northgate Mall. The site would then be converted to a park.

d. Will the proposal require any new roads or streets, or improvements to existing roads or streets, not including driveways? If so, generally describe (indicate whether public or private).

No

e. Will the project use (or occur in the immediate vicinity of) water, rail, or air transportation? If so, generally describe.

No

f. How many vehicular trips per day would be generated by the completed project? If known, indicate when peak volumes would occur.

Skatedots and Skatespots are local facilities, likely used by surrounding neighborhoods. These facilities will likely generate little increase in traffic with the exception of parents dropping off and picking up kids. Larger facilities may draw in a more regional user spectrum and possibly generate additional traffic, however, each site is served by local transit. Potential increases in traffic volumes will be evaluated on a case by case basis during the project level environmental review for each site.

g. Proposed measures to reduce or control transportation impacts, if any.

Use of the sites for skateboarding is not expected to have any noticeable impact on transportation at the Skatedot or Skatespot facility levels. District and Regional facilities would evaluate parking and transportation impacts during the project level environmental review.

15. Public Services

a. Would the project result in an increased need for public services (for example: fire protection, police protection, health care, schools, other)? If so, generally describe.

A small incremental increase in public services may be generated for added police and fire/aid protection, and park maintenance as a result of the plan.

b. Proposed measures to reduce or control direct impacts on public services, if any.

Facilities would be open to the public in keeping with all of Seattle's public park hours. A public phone would be provided for access to emergency services when injuries are sustained. Police Crime Prevention Taskforce would review and comment on the site designs to supply vital security recommendations.

16. Utilities

a. Circle utilities currently available at the site:
electricity, natural gas, water, refuse service, telephone, sanitary sewer, septic system, other.

The City is served by all utilities customarily found in urban areas.

b. Describe the utilities that are proposed for the project, the utility providing the service. and the general construction activities on the site or in the immediate vicinity which might be needed.

Water service, via manual quick couplers, would be provided for cleaning of the skatepark facilities

C. Signature

The above answers are true and complete to the best of my knowledge. I understand the lead agency is relying on them to make its decision.

Signature: <<signature on original>>

Date submitted: October 23, 2006

This checklist was reviewed by David Graves, Senior Planner, 10-23-2006 . Any comments or changes made by the Department are entered in the body of the checklist and contain the initials of the reviewer.

D. SUPPLEMENTAL SHEET FOR NONPROJECT ACTIONS
(Do not use this sheet for project actions)

Because these questions are very general, it may be helpful to read them in conjunction with the list of the elements of the environment. When answering these questions, be aware of the extent the proposal, or the types of activities likely to result from the proposal, would affect the item at a greater intensity or at a faster rate than if the proposal were not implemented. Respond briefly and in general terms.

1. How would the proposal be likely to increase discharge to water; emissions to air; production, storage, or release of toxic or hazardous substances; or production of noise?

Adoption of the Citywide Skatepark Plan is a programmatic action and would not increase discharges to water, emissions to air, productions, storage or the release of toxic or hazardous substances or the production of noise. At the project level, potential impacts or increases would by analyzed as a component of the project specific environmental review.

There could be short-term emissions of engine exhaust from vehicles and machinery associated with any construction activity. These impacts are expected to be minor in scale and localized in extent.

No known emissions to air would be released. It is unlikely that waste materials would enter ground or surface waters without being removed via oil/water separators, surface soils or settling out before reaching major water bodies. Runoff from skate facilities is considered 'clean' runoff. No long term impacts are expected.

Proposed measures to avoid or reduce such increases are:
At the project level, City of Seattle Best Management Practices would be utilized to control runoff as appropriate. During excavation and other related construction work, silt barriers would be installed to prevent silt flows into the storm water system. Use of properly tuned machinery, wetting of any exposed soils, and similar measures will reduce or avoid engine exhaust and dust problems that could occur during construction activities.

2. How would the proposal be likely to affect plants, animals, fish, or marine life?

Plants

Short Term Impacts
Adoption of the Citywide Skatepark Plan is a programmatic action and would not affect any vegetation. However, at the project level, construction would entail the removal or alteration of existing vegetation at specific sites as necessary to construct the skateboard facilities. This may include site renovation through tree pruning and removal, control of invasive weeds and restoration planting and erosion control measures during construction. No long term impacts are expected.

Animals

Adoption of the Citywide Skatepark Plan is a programmatic action and would not affect any animals. However, Seattle Parks are home to a variety of state and federally protected species. Specific sites have been chosen to have the least possible impact to wildlife. At the project level, construction noise may have an affect on local wildlife. No long term impacts are expected.
Proposed measures to protect or conserve plants, animals, fish, or marine life are:

At the project level, site specific landscaping will be developed and noted as a component of the project specific environmental review. Existing vegetation, exclusive of grass, will be preserved, relocated and/or incorporated into any project design to the extent practical.

At the project level, the Washington State Fish & Wildlife database will be consulted to determine the potential for impacts to protected wildlife, if any, and appropriate mitigation determined in cooperation with Fish & Wildlife.

3. How would the proposal be likely to deplete energy or natural resources?

The proposal would have no impact on energy or natural resources.

Proposed measures to protect or conserve energy and natural resources are:

None required.

4. How would the proposal be likely to use or affect environmentally sensitive areas or areas designated (or eligible or under study) for governmental protection; such as parks, wilderness, wild and scenic rivers, threatened or endangered species habitat, historic or cultural sites, wetlands, floodplains, or prime farmlands?

Seattle's Park system encompasses properties in a myriad of environmentally sensitive areas. Adoption of the Citywide Skatepark Plan is a programmatic action. At the project level, skatepark facilities will not be built in the following environmentally critical areas: designated wetlands, riparian corridors, wildlife habitats, flood prone areas, steep slopes, potential or known slide areas.

Genesee Playfield and portions of Judkins Park were built over old landfill areas. The challenges to building a skateboard facility in these sites is an engineering one. Myrtle Edwards Park is located in a liquefaction prone area (see checklist – 8h).

The Seattle Parks are home to a variety of state and federally protected species. Specific sites have been chosen to have the least possible impact to wildlife.

Of the 30 proposed skatepark sites in the Citywide Skatepark Plan, four have some level of historic or cultural significance or designation. At the programmatic level there would be no impact.

Gasworks Park – Historic Landmark pending
Hiawatha Playfield – Landmarked site, Olmsted designed
Cowen Park – Olmsted influenced design, Cowen Park Bridge on the National Register of Historic Places
Warren G. Magnuson Park – Identified as a potential Historic District for listing on the National Register of Historic Places

Proposed measures to protect such resources or to avoid or reduce impacts are:

If these sites are chosen, any construction activities will be consistent with the requirements of the City's ECA ordinance.

At the project level, the Washington State Fish & Wildlife database will be consulted to determine the potential for impacts to protected wildlife habitat, if any, and appropriate mitigation determined in cooperation with Fish & Wildlife.

At the project level, modifications to Historic Landmark sites would require approval by Seattle's Landmarks Board. The Sand Point Historic Preservation Coordinator, on behalf of the State Historic Preservation Officer, would review proposals prior to any construction for Magnuson Park.

5. How would the proposal be likely to affect land and shoreline use, including whether it would allow or encourage land or shoreline uses incompatible with existing plans?

The Citywide Skatepark Plan would not affect any existing shoreline or land uses. At the project level, skatepark facilities would result in an increase in park usage once skateboarding facilities are constructed since an additional park amenity will be provided which previously did not exist. However, the siting of a skatepark facility could result in the loss of passive open space, depending on the park and the location of the facility.

Proposed measures to avoid or reduce shoreline and land use impacts are:
Many of the sites proposed are currently covered with either asphalt, concrete or a gravel base, e.g. an existing roadway or parking lot, and there fore, represent no net loss of green space or increase in impervious surfacing at those sites. At the project level, landscaping and other vegetative amenities will be incorporated into the site designs. Proposed sites would not impact current shoreline uses.

6. How would the proposal be likely to increase demands on transportation or public services and utilities?

The Citywide Skatepark Plan itself would not increase demands on transportation, public services or utilities. However, at the project level, the City may see an increase in transit ridership to specific sites. Increases in public services, such as Parks maintenance and Police surveillance may increase at specific sites.

Proposed measures to reduce or respond to such demand(s) are:
At the project level, additional staffing would need to allocated for the new facilities.

7. Identify, if possible, whether the proposal may conflict with local, state, or federal laws or requirements for the protection of the environment.

The proposal would not conflict with local, state, or federal laws or requirements for the protection of the environment.